

know the full benefits of this McKinney Act program for school placement and support and should have every assurance of its continuation.

#### NOTE

Due to a printing error, a statement by Senator HARKIN on page S14840 of the RECORD of October 10, 1995, appears incorrectly. The permanent RECORD will be corrected to reflect the following correct statement.

#### SUPPORT OF THE PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Disability Policy, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the applicability of S. 143, the Work Force Development Act, to individuals with disabilities.

I would like to compliment Senator KASSEBAUM, the sponsor of the legislation and chair of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and Senator FRIST, the chair of the Subcommittee on Disability Policy, for including specific provisions in S. 143 that will enhance our Nation's ability to address the employment-related needs of individuals with disabilities, including individuals with significant disabilities. I am particularly pleased that these provisions were developed on a bipartisan basis and enjoy the broad-based support of the disability community.

On January 10, 1995, the Labor Committee heard testimony from Tony Young, on behalf of the employment and training task force of the Consortium for Citizens With Disabilities. CCD urged the Senate to recognize the positive advances made in the 1992 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and to take a two-pronged approach to addressing the needs of individuals with disabilities in our jobs consolidation legislation. I am pleased that the Senate bill adopted this two-pronged approach.

Under prong one, S. 143 guarantees individuals with disabilities meaningful and effective access to the core services and optional services that are made available to nondisabled individuals in generic work force employment activities and to work force education activities described in the legislation, consistent with nondiscrimination provisions set out in section 106(f)(7) of the legislation, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act.

The commitment to ensuring meaningful and effective access to generic services for individuals with disabilities is critical. Advocates for individuals with disabilities have often expressed concern that many current generic job training programs such as JTPA have not met the needs of individuals with disabilities. Ensuring access to generic services is critical for many people with disabilities who can benefit from such services.

The promise of access to generic services is also illustrated through

other provisions in S. 143. The purposes of the bill—(section 2(b))—include creating coherent, integrated statewide work force development systems designed to develop more fully the academic, occupational, and literacy skills of all segments of the population and ensuring that all segments of the work force will obtain the skills necessary to earn wages sufficient to maintain the highest quality of living in the world. The content of the State plan set out in section 104(c) of S. 143 must include information describing how the State will identify the current and future work force development needs of all segments of the population of the State. The term all is intended to include individuals with disabilities.

The accountability provisions in S. 143—(section 121(c)(4))—specify that States must develop quantifiable benchmarks to measure progress toward meeting State goals for specified populations, including at a minimum, individuals with disabilities.

Under S. 143, State vocational rehabilitation agencies must be involved in the planning and implementation of the generic system. For example, under section 104(d) of S. 143, the part of the State plan related to the strategic plan must describe how the State agency officials responsible for vocational rehabilitation collaborated in the development of the strategic plan. Under section 105(a) of S. 143, the work force development boards must include a representative from the State agency responsible for vocational rehabilitation and under section 118 of S. 143, local work force development boards must include one or more individuals with disabilities or their representatives.

Under prong two the current program of one-stop shopping for persons with disabilities, particularly those with severe disabilities, established under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended most recently in 1992, is retained, strengthened, and made an integral component of the statewide work force development system.

The current vocational rehabilitation system has helped millions of individuals with disabilities over the past 75 years to achieve employment. Since the 1992 amendments, the number of individuals assisted in achieving employment each year has increased steadily. In fiscal year 1994, 203,035 individuals achieved employment, up 5.8 percent from fiscal year 1992, the year just prior to the passage of the amendments. Data for the first three quarters of fiscal year 1995 show a 8.4 percent increase in the number of individuals achieving employment as compared to the first three quarters for fiscal year 1994.

In fiscal year 1993, 85.7 percent of the individuals achieving employment through vocational rehabilitation were either competitively employed or self-employed. Seventy-seven percent of individuals who achieved employment as a result of the vocational rehabilitation program report that their own in-

come is the primary source of support rather than depending on entitlement or family members.

The percent of persons with earned income of any kind increased from 21 percent at application to 90 percent at closure. The gain in the average hourly wage rate from application to the achievement of an employment outcome was \$4.36 per person. Of the individuals achieving employment in fiscal year 1993, their mean weekly earnings at the time of their application to the program was \$32.20, compared to \$204.10 at closure, an average weekly increase of \$164.90.

In 1993, the General Accounting Office [GAO] found that an individual who completed a vocational rehabilitation program was significantly more likely than an individual who did not complete the program of working for wages 5 years after exiting the program. In addition, the GAO found that individuals who achieved an employment outcome demonstrated four times the gain in wages compared to the other groups studied.

I am also pleased to share with my colleagues the positive impact that vocational rehabilitation is having in my home State of Iowa. During fiscal year 1993-94, 5,717 Iowans with disabilities were rehabilitated through the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services [DVRS]. At referral to DVRS, 33 percent have weekly earnings; at closure the rate went to 98 percent. Average weekly earnings rose from \$49.94 at referral to \$229.45 at closure. In addition, the Iowa Department for the Blind provided 765 blind persons with vocational rehabilitation services. At closure the average weekly income was \$352.00. Seventy-three percent of those rehabilitated found work in the competitive labor market, including work in occupations such as psychologist, tax accountant, teacher, food service, and radio repair.

Mr. President, as I explained previously in my remarks, under S. 143, title I of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended most recently in 1992, is not repealed; rather it is retained, strengthened, and made an integral component of the statewide work force development system.

For example, the findings and purposes section of title I of the Rehabilitation Act are amended to make it clear that programs of vocational rehabilitation are intended to be an integral component of a State's work force development system. Further, the amendments clarify that linkages between the vocational rehabilitation program established under title I of the Rehabilitation Act and other components of the statewide work force development system are critical to ensure effective and meaningful participation by individuals with disabilities in work force development activities.

Section 14 and section 106 of title I of the Rehabilitation Act pertaining to

evaluations of the program are amended to make it clear that, to the maximum extent appropriate, standards for determining effectiveness of the program must be consistent with State benchmarks established under the Work Force Development Act for all employment programs.

Provisions in the State plan under title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 are also amended to include specific strategies for strengthening the vocational rehabilitation program as an integral component of the statewide work force development system established by the State. A cooperative agreement will be required to link the VR agency with the consolidated system. The cooperative agreement will address each State's unique system and will assure, for example, reciprocal referrals between the VR agency and the other components of the statewide system. The linkages will also assure that the staff at both agencies are adequately and appropriately trained. Most importantly, the linkages must be replicated at the local level so that the local office of the VR agency is working closely with the one-stop center in the community to make a seamless system of services a reality.

Many State vocational rehabilitation agencies, including the agency in Iowa, are already involved with efforts to link vocational rehabilitation with other components of the statewide system of work force development. The States that report the most success are those where the vocational rehabilitation agencies are involved in the consolidation efforts at the early planning stages. The other aspect that is critical to ensure success is the replication of cooperative agreements in local communities so that the VR counselors are working closely with the other job training programs in the statewide system.

In closing, Mr. President, I strongly support the provisions of S. 143 pertaining to individuals with disabilities. The bill ensures meaningful and effective access to the generic training and education programs. In addition, the amendments to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 will strengthen and support the involvement of vocational rehabilitation in a State's seamless system of work force development while ensuring the continued integrity and viability of the current program.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the Workforce Development Act. It confronts one of the most important issues affecting this Nation today—that is to make sure that America's work force is job ready for the 21st century.

Mr. President, I like this bill because it creates a one-stop delivery system for employment services. It recognizes the needs of dislocated workers; and it helps to streamline the job training process for everyone, including welfare recipients, by consolidating existing job training programs.

First, I like one-stop shopping, and I like streamlining the process. With

this bill, States will be required to create one-stop career centers offering access to anyone who needs it. One-stop career centers mean more centralized services all in one place. They make the job training system more efficient and more effective.

Anyone who wants to can go to one location for job placement, job assistance, and job referral. One-stop centers link workers to the full range of services they will need, and I think that is great.

My State of Maryland is ahead of the game in creating one-stop centers. Maryland's one stop center in Columbia, MD is up and running and helping to make job training services easier and more efficient for all Maryland workers. It is an idea that I wholeheartedly support.

Second, Mr. President, I especially like the amendments to this bill that protect dislocated workers. Senator DODD has worked very hard to include a provision that creates a rapid response emergency fund for people affected by base closing, plant closing, and natural disasters.

In Maryland, we have seen tremendous job loss, plant closures, and company downsizing. According to the Baltimore Sun, Maryland could lose 20,000 to 50,000 Federal jobs in the next 5 years. That is a lot of jobs, a lot of people, and lot of families that will receive a big financial blow.

The Dodd amendment is very important to Maryland families who have lost income due to base closing—like Fort Richie, White Oak, David Taylor in Annapolis, and the Army Publications Distribution Center in Middle River.

These workers are men and women who have mortgages to pay, homes to heat, and other bills to pay in order to keep their families going. They need to know that their concerns were heard.

Further, Mr. President, Senator BREAU and Senator DASCHLE have also offered an amendment to create vouchers for dislocated workers. The amendment further improves the bill by maximizing dislocated workers ability to choose what job training best fits their needs. They can make their own judgments and determine their own future.

I support the Dodd and Breau amendments on behalf of all the Marylanders who have lost their jobs or who stand to lose their jobs today, tomorrow and in the future.

I am also pleased that we will continue our commitment to workers who have lost their jobs through changes in the international market.

I am talking about the importance of keeping our promises. Promises we made to protect workers from the possible effects of NAFTA and GATT.

I am pleased that this bill will not repeal the Target Adjustment Act, and instead preserves our responsibility to help dislocated workers. That is why I support Senator MOYNIHAN's amendment to take the Trade Adjustment Act out of this bill.

Third, Mr. President, the Senate recently considered welfare reform legislation. Welfare reform and the job training bill we consider today must work hand-in-hand.

If we want to be successful in keeping people off welfare, we must have in place a system that will allow people to change careers and change skills when the economy and technology forces them to.

I think that good job training programs are important to making welfare reform efforts successful. Welfare reform is about helping people get into jobs and stay jobs through job training and part-time work. This bill does that.

The one-stop centers created in this bill will allow welfare recipients to get the help they need to be job ready. They will get job counseling, skills assessment and other services all in one place. I believe that everyone can be well prepared, self sufficient and successful.

Finally, Mr. President, a lot of progress was made to improve this bill since the Labor Committee markup. I support the changes and the amendments improving the job training programs so that they operate more efficiently.

But, I am pleased that this bill does not repeal title V of the Older Americans Act, the Senior Employment Program.

When the Labor Committee considered this bill, I had very serious concerns about how it would impact on our seniors. I offered an amendment in committee to take the Senior Employment Program out of the block grant because it provides an important service to seniors in this country. And although my amendment lost in committee, the Senior Employment Program has been removed from the bill we consider today.

The Senior Employment Program provides over 100,000 seniors an opportunity for employment, community service, and self-reliance.

Throughout this Nation, the Senior Employment Program is essential to providing important community services. Libraries are kept open in Baltimore so children can read. Ailing older people and children receive care through child and adult day care. Seniors and homebound persons in Catonsville and Hagerstown receive nutritious meals at senior centers and through Meals-on-Wheels.

Mr. President, this program is based on the principles of personal responsibility, lifelong learning, and service to community. It is too important to seniors to be considered as part of this bill, and it should rightfully be considered as part of the Older American's Act reauthorization.

I would like to thank the Labor Committee chair, Senator KASSEBAUM, for

her willingness to work with me to remove the Senior Employment Program from this block grant.

Mr. President, I am all for the idea of one-stop shopping, streamlining and simplifying the job training process, providing assistance for job readiness, and promoting some state flexibility. I am supporting this bill because I believe that job training and education are vital to creating a productive work force.

I commend Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator KENNEDY for their work on this bill and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, today the Senate will complete its consideration of the Work Force Development Act, legislation which will reform the existing system of Federal job training programs. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, I recommend this bill to my colleagues for three specific reasons.

This bill before us will reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government's bureaucracy by eliminating a number of ineffective or duplicative job training programs and, in addition, consolidating many others. This legislation will shift much of the resources and responsibility for operating the remaining programs to the States which are better capable of designing and running effective education and job training programs. Finally—and I believe most importantly—these reforms will help ensure that American workers have the necessary education and skills to compete successfully in the global economy our Nation faces as we enter the 21st century.

Before I elaborate on each of these important endeavors, let me first commend the Senator from Kansas, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, for her dedication to this issue and for her efforts to develop this measure and bring it to the floor. This has been an area of longstanding interest for the chairman, and her staff along with all of the members of the committee have been working on this legislation the entire year. In fact, job training reform was the subject of the first hearings the Labor Committee held this session.

Mr. President, it also should be noted that the chairman and the committee staff have worked very closely with the Governors—Democrat and Republican alike—in developing a structure for this work force development system which will allow the necessary Federal oversight to ensure accountability for the States while still providing them with tremendous flexibility. As with welfare reform, this bill represents the advent of a renewed effort toward consultation and cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. This new Federal-State relationship is critical not only to making programs such as job training and welfare successful, but it is essential to solving many other problems confronting our society as well.

Mr. President, let me return to the accomplishments of this legislation. First is the issue of eliminating unnecessary duplication and bureaucracy among the existing Federal job training programs.

At last count, according to the Government Accounting Office, there are 163 separate Federal job training programs being run by 1 of 15 Federal agencies. Altogether, these programs cost taxpayers more than \$20 billion a year. While those numbers alone are astounding, what is even more surprising is the incredible overlap and redundancy of many of these programs. For instance, there are at least 60 programs aimed at assisting the economically disadvantaged, including 34 programs designed to address literacy alone. To add to the confusion, many of these same programs have differing standards for assessing income and other eligibility criteria.

However, Mr. President, perhaps the most shocking aspect of the present Federal job training system is the near total lack of accountability. There is essentially no reliable record of results. Fewer than half of the sixty-two training programs scrutinized in a recent GAO investigation bothered to keep track of whether participants had obtained jobs following their training. And only a handful of those programs chose to evaluate whether the training that was provided proved integral to securing employment or whether the individual participant could have obtained the job without receiving the training in question.

Mr. President, these facts alone would warrant a dramatic overhaul of the Federal job training system with the goal of eliminating ineffective programs, consolidating programs with identical or similar constituencies and services, and creating a reliable measure of accountability. However, I believe we should go further. And in this bill, we do.

In the legislation which is before us, we give the States the resources and the responsibility to establish their own comprehensive, integrated statewide work force development systems. We allow each State to develop a network of education, job training and employment services which reflects their own unique needs and circumstances. Yet we also demand results from the States and have devised a means by which we can assure fairness, integrity, and results.

Why, Mr. President, is it so important that the States be given the responsibility for running these programs? There are two basic reasons. The first is efficiency. It should come as no surprise that any Federal job training system—responsible for serving all 50 States—would suffer from inordinate overlap and redundancy. The present system has 19 programs which target youth, as well as several programs serving each of a variety of constituencies, including veterans, seniors, dislocated workers, and displaced homemakers.

States, however, are better situated to determine the actual needs of particular constituencies—to the extent those needs differ from that of other individuals seeking assistance. And States are much more likely than the Federal Government to have an accurate assessment of the realistic job opportunities which exist within the State's economy. As Father Bill Cunningham of Detroit's fabulously successful Focus: Hope training program told the Labor Committee back in January: Before any job training program can be successful, we must understand the difference between simply providing jobs for people and that of providing capable and skilled persons to meet the job demands. That is a critical distinction, but one that is often overlooked.

Mr. President, a significant problem with the current system is that it is both diffuse and duplicative; individuals seeking assistance often have no idea of where to turn for the help they need. And the various outlets for services usually have no capability or network they can utilize to connect those individuals with particular needs with the services they require. The States are better suited to devise and operate a comprehensive, integrated system that will address these shortcomings while still remaining sensitive to local needs and problems. Whereas the current system generally creates a new program to address every exigent circumstance, States can create a central system which will meet a variety of needs and demands and serve a diverse array of clientele.

In the State of Michigan, we have already spent enormous time and effort creating our own statewide work force development system, one that we call Michigan Works! The Michigan Works! system utilizes an approach known as no wrong door. This concept means that through whatever point you access the State work force development system, you will either be directly provided or put in contact with any of the services you need.

Mr. President, this is the case:

If you are an adult on public assistance trying to get your high school equivalency degree so you can get a job; or

If you are working at a low skill, low wage job, and you are desiring to learn a trade or a skill which will allow you to find a better job and earn a better living to support you and your family; or

If you are a laid-off assembly line worker who wants to receive computer training or another high-technology skill to prepare you for the high-wage jobs that are increasingly the boon of our economy.

Regardless of who you are or where you enter the system, all the services you could possibly need are only a phone call away because Michigan Works! has instituted a 1-800 number to

facilitate access into its work force development system.

Mr. President, the second reason that States ought to be given control of these job training programs is one to which I have already alluded: namely, flexibility.

Each State has its own distinct demographic or economic concerns that require a unique approach, and Michigan is no different. However, Michigan must also take into consideration its geographical diversity as well. Michigan's southeastern and south central regions are primarily urban and suburban, whereas the western and northern portions of the Michigan's lower peninsula are predominantly rural. And the most obvious unique feature that Michigan has to contend with is the Upper Peninsula. While the Upper Peninsula is in many areas is essentially remote wilderness, there are still over 300,000 people living there. With the area economy linked as it is to agriculture and tourism, the unemployment rate during the winter months can be as high as 20 to 25 percent. And this is true as well for a number of areas in the northern portion of the Lower Peninsula.

Obviously, these contrasting areas will require vastly different approaches by the Michigan Works! system if the residents of these areas are all to be served adequately. It would not be logistically feasible or economically efficient for us to have every possible resource or service that a person in the Upper Peninsula might need available just around the corner. That is just not practical. So for Michigan it is imperative that options exist beyond the conventional notion of the one-stop career center, where all of the requisite services are available in one central location.

Michigan Works! envisions having several different service delivery options. One of these, the multiple points of entry would be ideal for the Upper Peninsula since it proposes to electronically link work force development agencies with service delivery providers and customers—even when all three may be separated geographically. Another option would possibly be ideal for the rural areas of the northern southern peninsula and among the smaller cities sprinkled throughout western Michigan. The hub and cluster model would contain a main center with several multiple points of entry throughout the given region to provide outreach and additional service delivery. These mechanisms could be combined with one-stop centers in our major urban areas to comprise Michigan's statewide work force development system. This array of options is possible precisely because of the flexibility afforded States in this legislation.

Finally, Mr. President, the most compelling reason I find for reforming our Federal job training system is the issue of our international economic competitiveness. To paraphrase the

conclusion drawn in the committee report: Faced with increasingly stiff global competition, corporate restructuring, and continuing Federal budget deficits, our country cannot afford to support a job training system that wastes precious resources, fails to help train people for the jobs of tomorrow, and does not assist employers by providing a work force which meets their labor needs.

One of the criticisms of this bill is that it does not mandate the continuation of local work force development boards. While that is true, States are still required to institute some form of State-local partnership to promote adequate consultation and cooperation. And if States do establish local development boards, a majority of the members of these board must come from business and industry. Business must be a key, if not dominant, feature in the decisionmaking process in order for any work force development system to succeed. In Michigan, we are already committed to having local development boards, and we are committed to ensuring that the private sector is the dominant force on those panels.

Mr. President, to encourage States to establish local work force development boards, this bill offers such States an expanded array of permissible economic development activities for which they can utilize funds from their so-called flex account. These economic development activities represent the cutting edge of any truly innovative work force development system. They include:

Customized assessments of the skills of workers and an analysis of the skill needs of employers in the State;

Upgrading the skills of incumbent workers;

Productivity and quality improvement training programs for small- and medium-sized employers;

Recognition and use of voluntary, industry developed skill standards;

Training activities in companies that are developing modernization plans in conjunction with State industrial extension service offices; and

Onsite, industry specific training programs supportive of industrial and economic development.

Mr. President, I believe activities such as these are instrumental to any successful statewide work force development system. They are also exactly the type of policies which will improve our ability as a Nation to prosper in an increasingly competitive modern global economy. With the pace of advances made in technology and the increasing frequency with which American workers change jobs, it is of paramount importance that workers, businesses, and whole industries be able to adjust rapidly to such circumstances by bolstering existing training or learning new skills. Mr. President, now is the time to lay the ground work for such a capability and enhance our competitiveness heading into the next century. This bill represents a golden oppor-

tunity to accomplish this important objective.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I support this legislation because it accomplishes three of the primary goals I had in coming to Washington as a U.S. Senator. It eliminates Federal Government waste by reducing ineffective or duplicative programs—and the bureaucracy which oversees them. It gives to States, localities, and the private sector much stronger control over matters such as education, job training, and economic development. And last, I believe this legislation will produce a vastly improved American work force development system and, in turn, increase American competitiveness in the years to come.

It is for those reasons that I strongly support this legislation, and I sincerely hope that the vast majority of my colleagues will see fit to support it as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief description of eight different training programs which are part of the Michigan Works! system be entered in the RECORD.

If my colleagues will look they will see that these programs are very innovative and quite often address a particular constituency or a unique need. These are exactly the types of programs which I believe will prosper and proliferate under the legislation we are considering today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXAMPLES OF MICHIGAN WORK FORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

##### EARN WHILE YOU LEARN (NOMINATING SPONSOR: THE JOB FORCE)

Provides opportunities for youth to develop modern employment skills while instilling a spirit of community service.

Students decide when, where, and how the project will proceed.

Uniqueness: 1994 NaCO Award for Excellence recipient (one of three nationally).

Results: 80 percent of the students suffered no learning loss; 60 percent increased their scores on the Michigan Assessment Test in either Math or Reading.

##### ACCELERATED TRAINING PROGRAMS (THE JOB FORCE)

Bay De Noc Community College, Michigan Works!, MESD, Delta/Schoolcraft ISD, and local employers have collaborated their strengths, talents and resources in a flexible, results-oriented education and training system.

Program has integrated and coordinated various local, State and Federal resources to offer accelerated training program to local residents that meet the demands of the employer community.

The first venture was for an accelerated machine tool program. The program lasts for 12 weeks. There are 9 students enrolled. Eighteen employers will be on the training site to interview prospective students for employment.

Efforts are underway for the recruitment for a new class beginning in August. It is anticipated that 20 students will be enrolled into this program.

## MDS CAA/HEAD START/FAMILY SERVICE (THE JOB FORCE)

The Job Force and MDS CAA Head Start program have joined together in developing the Family Service Center (FSC).

FSC is a demonstration project which will strengthen the capacity of both agencies in addressing the problems of families reaching self-sufficiency as they relate to illiteracy, employability, and substance abuse.

FSC offers employability skills training, employment training positions, while coordinating with DSS programs.

Program evaluation has reported that FSC participating families exceeded control families in almost all employment preparation and job seeker behaviors.

## TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAM TITLE IIC (REGION II)

Participating agencies: Jackson ISD, Hillsdale ISD, and Lenawee ISD.

Exposes JTPA eligible youth in a process to better understand the utilization of various work-related problem solving technologies.

Goal: Arouse participant career interests and encourage the development of individual education and employment goals thereby resulting in continued school enrollment and attendance.

## CHRISTIAN OUTREACH REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT (BERRIEN/CASS/VAN BUREN CO. SDA'S)

Collaboration between several organizations utilizing JTPA's work experience program.

Assists the 21st Initiative Neighborhood Housing Program create safe, affordable high quality homes for purchase by low and moderate income families.

Provides hands-on job training of basic construction skills, work ethic and work maturity.

Results: 85.7 percent positive retention rate through June, 1995.

## MEDICAL INSURANCE BILLING (MIB) (KALAMAZOO/ST. JOSEPH)

A training program that is employer driven based on high demand, high wages and excellent placement and retention rates.

Participating agencies: local hospital, Kalamazoo Valley Community College, private industry, Upjohn Institute, and the PIC.

The hospital initiated the MIB program by identifying a need existed.

Kalamazoo Valley CC developed a customized training program and hired trainers.

The MIB program included core instructors who were employed in the medical field.

Customer satisfaction surveys received after the first MIB training resulted in improvements and changes.

Within 5 weeks of completing the training, 54 percent of the participants were employed in a medical practice with an average wage over \$7.50/hr.

## WORKPLACE INCUBATOR (THUMB AREA)

Workplace incubators are designed to provide a simulated workplace situation which (1) supports regular work experience habits; (2) supports exposure to varying occupational areas; and (3) supports the overall development of an individual's work ethic.

Operating within the county-based Vocational Technical Centers in each of the four counties of the SDA.

Significant roles in preparing individuals for the real "world of work."

Uniqueness—one of the unique features of the incubators is its cost effective/cost efficient method of promoting and utilizing collaborative partnerships.

Partnership between DSS, ISD's, CBO's, local health dept, community colleges, adult ed providers, Cooperative Extension, local

literacy, area employers, numerous non-profit agencies, MESCC, CMH, and MRS.

Results: incubators compliment all other job training activities by adding the "real world of work" flavor in a relatively compact period of time.

Incubators are a cost effective/cost efficient job training activity which can be tailored to suit the needs of any locale and/or target population, and can easily be assimilated into most job training curriculums.

## WOMEN FIRST! (MACOMB/ST. CLAIR)

Began in Jan. 1993 as a model targeted at communities where a higher percentage of female heads of household are living below the poverty level.

Project was committed to resolving 100 percent of the barriers that prevented women from successfully completing training programs that would start them on the road to economic independence by jointly coordinating outreach, case management and follow-up support.

The project has exemplified what can be accomplished when two agencies work together on behalf of customers.

Joint outreach coordinated by the PIC and Macomb Co Community Services Agency.

Results: Exceeded planned enrollment. As of May, three women were still attending training and 76 percent of the women were employed as a result of the Women First program.

## INDIAN POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am interested in preserving the current policy and practice in the Carl Perkins Act for Indian postsecondary vocational institutions. During each of the last 6 years \$4 million has been authorized and \$2.9 million has been appropriated each year to provide some stability and base operational support for the nationally accredited tribal postsecondary vocational education institutions. Both the Crownpoint Institute of Technology in New Mexico and the United Tribes Technical College in North Dakota are currently supported with these funds. My concern is that this support not be abandoned in the legislation under consideration. I understand that the senior Senator from Arizona, who chairs the Committee of Indian Affairs, would also like to address this issue.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Mexico. I support the provisions in Senate bill 143 and would oppose any effort that would earmark funding for a specific Indian vocational institution, at the expense of all other Indian higher education institutions. I remind Senator BINGAMAN that the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, in a September 8, 1995, letter to him, strongly opposed such a proposal. I agree with them. To the extent there is less funding available for all 29 tribal postsecondary institutions throughout Indian Country in the coming fiscal years, the reductions should be shouldered by all of these schools in an equitable manner and in proportion to how the fiscal year 1995 funds were allocated. I know that this is the intention of my colleague from New Mexico. And, in fact, that is the intention of provisions that were developed by the Committee on

Indian Affairs and that were incorporated into S. 143.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to join this discussion to clarify the intentions of The Workforce Development Act, S. 143, with regard to continued funding for Crownpoint Institute of Technology [CIT]. The fundamental concern we all have is that in replacing the Carl Perkins Act we are also potentially removing the only support CIT has for its basic operating expenses, and we clearly want to avoid this kind of financial disaster for CIT. The problem arises because CIT is the only tribally controlled community college or postsecondary vocational institute in Indian country that is not funded through the Department of the Interior. This odd situation is the result of the enabling legislation for Tribally Controlled Community Colleges that allows each tribe to have only one college. Since CIT and the Navajo Community College [NCC] are both on the Navajo Nation, only NCC qualifies for Interior funding under this act. CIT has relied on the Carl Perkins Act for its basic operating expenses, and receives no Interior Department funding. While fully supporting the block grant concept in this legislation, we want to assure the continuation of CIT and affirm the intention of this legislation to do so.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senators. I have tried to maintain existing protections for the Crownpoint institution because of the important work it accomplishes. I do not want that to be at the expense of other fine tribal schools. And I thank the Senator from Arizona for clarifying that if there are funding reductions, they be applied proportionately to the tribal schools affected. I would ask the chairwoman of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Senator KASSEBAUM, whether she shares the views set forth by Senator MCCAIN?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I thank the Senators for their comments. I wish to associate myself with Senator MCCAIN's remarks in this regard. In a cooperative effort of our two committees, Senator MCCAIN and I developed these provisions with the intention that funding be authorized among the various tribal schools in proportion to the Federal allocations that they have received in prior years.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to additionally point out to the Senator from New Mexico that the House and Senate Committee report language reflects the intent that these funds should be distributed in the manner we have set forth.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I do thank the Senators for their remarks. It is my understanding then that if overall funding levels are maintained, the equivalent of the level of base operational support provided in fiscal year 1995 should be allocated to these Indian vocational education institutions. But if funding for these purposes is less than fiscal year 1995 levels, a lesser amount would

be distributed based on each school's share of the overall amount it received in 1995.

Mr. MCCAIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate these clarifications and the commitment shown by Senators MCCAIN, KASSEBAUM, and DOMENICI.

#### REFORMING THE FEDERAL JOB TRAINING SYSTEM

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I intend to vote for this job training legislation as an indication of my support for efforts to reform the Federal job training system into an integrated, comprehensive, State-based work force development system that serves the real needs of unemployed and underemployed workers. I believe the current system does need to be reformed, streamlined, and made more decentralized, and its performance must be measured more accurately. Though there are parts of this bill with which I still seriously disagree, I will vote today to move the process forward and send the bill into conference with the House.

We started this process several years ago when Democrats developed our own proposal to streamline the job training system. The scores of Federal programs, which spend over \$20 billion annually, must be made more coordinated and more coherent, and must better meet the actual needs of job-seekers. On that we are all agreed.

We have come a long way from the original version of this bill that was put forth by Senator KASSEBAUM. The version we will vote on today, while still imperfect, is a more streamlined, more responsible piece of legislation than the one that was considered by the full Labor and Human Resources Committee some months ago.

The governance structure established by the original bill was unwieldy, unaccountable, and open to serious abuse, potentially giving quasi-private entities approval power over billions in Federal spending. It has been much improved, and now final authority and accountability rests with the Secretaries of Education and Labor, where it should be. There are still some refinements to be made in conference, including stronger accountability mechanisms and standards, to protect against potential abuses, but it is a marked improvement over the original proposal.

Since the House does not have such an unwieldy and convoluted governance structure, I hope the conferees will streamline and simplify it, making the lines of accountability clearer in the final bill. The provisions that require states to develop Statewide work force development plans, in consultation with local authorities, and that require benchmarking of their performance, with specific penalties if they have not performed well, have also been improved.

The amended version of the bill retains Job Corps as a national program, with strict national oversight stand-

ards, a zero-tolerance drug policy, and other key reforms. For people in my State served by the HHH Job Corps Center in the Twin Cities, which serves hard-to-serve young people who might otherwise be effectively shut out of our social and economic life together, retaining and strengthening Job Corps, while providing for new guidelines and performance benchmarks, was a key step forward. We heard in the committee from young people who had been helped by the HHH Center's programs, and by others in Job Corps Programs throughout the country. Though some Job Corps centers are in need of reform, much of which is required by this bill, I believe strongly in the program and will continue to support it.

We have also fixed the outrageous provision in the original bill that would have repealed the Federal Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for workers dislocated by U.S. trade policies—including NAFTA and GATT. I was an original cosponsor of this amendment because those programs have served thousands of people in my State, providing both job training and income support assistance during interim periods while they looked for new jobs, and I did not believe we could go back on our word to provide workers with such aid. Even those who supported NAFTA made this commitment to help these workers, and it would have been truly outrageous if our amendment had not been approved. Since the House version of the bill does not repeal this program either, I am confident the final version of the bill will preserve it.

There were several other key improvements to the bill that were made during Senate consideration. The Senate's adoption of the amendment to set aside funds for a rapid response fund, administered by the Secretary of Labor, for workers dislocated by mass layoffs like plant closures, disasters, or other similar contingencies, was critically important. In addition to this provision, there should also be a mandate that States must serve dislocated workers; that is not in the current version of the bill, and should be included in conference. While some States, perhaps most, will likely serve these workers, there should be a guarantee in the bill that they be served.

The bill provides for at least some assistance to migrant workers, though as under current law far less than is actually needed for that often desperately poor and mobile population. It provides key job protections for people in State employment service offices, and requires health and safety, antidiscrimination, and other protections for job training program participants.

It mandates that States provide at least some level of summer youth job training assistance, though I remain very concerned that efforts to virtually gut the program's funding in the appropriations process may yet be successful, leaving hundreds of thousands of American youth without jobs during

the summer in some of the most desperate inner-city neighborhoods of our Nation. But I have fought the first round of that fight on the rescissions bill, and the second round of that funding fight will come later this month.

The bill imposes a cap on the amount of job training funds that can be used by States for economic development activities, to ensure against their being used as just an economic development honey-pot that does not serve the primary purposes for which these Federal funds are intended—job retraining and reemployment. It also includes key provisions, which I insisted upon when the Labor Committee considered the bill, which require that representatives of veterans be given a seat on work force development boards, and be consulted along with other community leaders as State job training plans are developed. I am pleased that my efforts to include these provisions in the bill were successful.

As I have said, there are still serious problems with this bill. Overall, it makes substantial cuts in job training program funding, at precisely the time we should be maintaining adequate funding, investing in the character, skills and intellect of our people. While there may be some modest administrative savings from consolidating programs, I think that the huge savings estimated by some are wildly exaggerated, and are nowhere near the amounts cut in this bill. These reduced levels undermine our ability to provide American workers with the job training, education, and employment services they need to meet the needs of the next century.

It also moves us a step away from a Federal system which targets resources to those who most need it—dislocated workers, economically disadvantaged adults, and others—a trend which could prove disastrous if cash-strapped States decide they cannot afford to serve these populations. I am worried about that, and believe we in Congress will have to carefully monitor the program's implementation to ensure that those who are most in need are served by the States.

In addition, I think including education programs in a job training consolidation effort is a serious mistake. I worked hard at the beginning of this legislative process to keep programs like Perkins Vocational Education Program out of this bill. I believe that program in particular should maintain its focus as an education program instead of being swept into a job training bill.

Overall, this bill eliminates six separate education programs and turns them into a block grant to the States. The block grant funds are to be used for vocational education and adult education, but the bill sets no minimum level of funding for either function. We have worked hard to improve the Perkins program and to use it to help integrate vocational and academic education. By repealing Perkins we risk



taking several steps backward in those efforts.

This bill reduces funding for important education programs, including vocational education at the high school and college level. By reducing the Federal dollars allocated to education programs, and creating a block grant to serve both education and job training needs, we will likely divert much-needed funds from key education programs. I am hopeful that the education provisions of the bill will be overhauled in conference, and that some of the job training changes I have urged will also be addressed. I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I am reluctantly voting for final passage of the Workforce Development Act, as amended by the Senate.

I believe several of these amendments were key to making the bill much more favorable to California. I say I support the bill reluctantly because I believe the overall 15-percent reduction in job training funding is unwise for this country and the cut in funding for California is unfair for my State still struggling out of an economic recession, repeated, disproportionate base closings, and downsizings and dislocations in defense and other industries.

Nevertheless, I will vote for the bill because I support the underlying program to consolidate our many separate job training programs, just as I supported the similar Democratic version in the last session of the Congress. As debate on this bill has shown, there is bipartisan interest in consolidating and reforming our job training programs to provide more flexibility to deal with our changing economy.

But there were some programs eliminated in the committee bill that I was pleased have been restored by the full Senate.

One of these was the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. This program provides services to workers who lose their jobs as a result of competition from imported goods. It is a critical program to continue in the wake of the North American Free-Trade Agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This program was restored to our job training program by the Moynihan amendment.

I also supported the amendment offered by Senator SIMON and Senator SPECTER, to keep the Job Corps Program a national program.

The committee bill would have turned the program over to the States as part of the block grant for job training. It would have been a State option to continue Job Corps.

Job Corps is one of the most successful programs to emerge from the efforts of Congress in the 1960's to attack the crisis in urban poverty and unemployment. Created in 1964, the Job Corps is the oldest, largest, and most comprehensive residential training and education program for young, unemployed, and undereducated youths ages 16-24.

In 1982 Job Corps was incorporated into the Republican-sponsored Job Training and Partnership Act, authored by then-Senator Dan Quayle. It was a good idea in 1964, it was a good idea in 1982, and it is still a good idea in 1995.

The Clinton administration has already addressed many of the problems often cited about the Job Corps. The Labor Department is imposing tougher performance standards, better screenings of participants and contractors, and other steps. Many of these reforms would be made law under the Specter-Simon Amendment.

This amendment would also weed out some of the weaker performing centers over the next 5 years. It would not abruptly close 25 centers—a quarter of the Job Corps, as the bill before us would do.

None of the six centers in California would be closed directly under the committee bill. California centers have not had problems in behavior and management that were targeted by the Inspector General.

However, two new centers for Long Beach and San Francisco were selected in 1994 to become operational in 1997. The Kassebaum bill would not authorize funds to operate these two new centers. This would be a particular blow for the Long Beach area, where the economy will suffer from the planned closing of the naval shipyard.

Last program-year about 3,700 students participated in Job Corps at six centers throughout California and more than 80 percent were placed in jobs, joined the military, or pursued further education—a rate higher than the national average.

Even if California agrees to continue to operate these centers under a State program—and that is not assured—the centers would still lose if the national program is eliminated. Job Corps trains students to get jobs in the national market, not just the region. Enrollees can choose centers across the country that best match their career plans. Nationwide Job Corps provides vocational training in more than 100 trades, including construction, marketing, mechanics, and agriculture.

Why replace one relatively small, cost-efficient bureaucracy to administer the program nationally with 50 separate bureaucracies in the States?

There are nearly 730,000 youth living in poverty in California, the most of any State and about 200,000 higher than the next highest State, Texas. There are an estimated 151,000 youths in California in need of Job Corps. There are only 3 youths in California enrolled in Job Corps for every 100 who need to be enrolled. Nationally, there are 18 enrolled for every 100 who need it.

In California, from 1980 to 1990 the unemployment among black teenagers rose from 26 to 31 percent, for Hispanic youth 16 to 21 percent and for white teenagers from 13 to 15 percent.

Mr. President, I have been acutely aware of the impact of the Job Corps in

California since I was elected to the Senate.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors in January 1993 passed a resolution on Job Corps which said in part:

... The unwillingness of society to invest in disadvantaged young people results in high unemployment rates, discouragement, a disinvestment in society, and frustration, and the costs of the unwillingness to invest results in incalculable discouragement, suffering and violence throughout, in particular, the African-American, Hispanic, and other disadvantaged communities, as well as throughout the entire City of San Francisco ...

The same can be said for Los Angeles, San Diego, San Bernardino, Sacramento and San Jose—the other cities in my State with centers which have provided more than \$2 million in community-related services since 1989.

This is not a perfect bill, but the bipartisan action on the Senate floor has made it a better bill. The final version will not be known until the Senate works out its differences with a similar bill in the House. I will be watching that process and will reserve my support until I can see the final version.

One of the areas ripe for improvement will be to require the use of local workforce development boards. The Senate bill allows but does not mandate this key element in an effective delivery of job training services. These boards are essential to ensuring a meaningful leadership role for business and other private-sector representatives in the development and operation of employment and training programs. Their role would be similar to that of the private industry councils which serve now under the Job Training Partnership Act.

I urge the Senate conferees to support local oversight of job training services by requiring the local workforce development boards.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support the purposes of this legislation but continue to have some real concerns about certain provisions in the bill. I am particularly concerned about the Federal governance structure mandated in the bill, including: the ambiguous relationships between the two secretaries; the unprecedented use of a board structure to run an operating agency; the composition of the proposed Federal partnership; and the drastic Federal staffing cuts. Each of these issues gives me great pause. Taken together, I fear that effectiveness of job training consolidation may be jeopardized.

Proponents offer two key reasons for such significant organizational change—the first is to save money, and the second is to provide better service. I do not believe that we will achieve either under the current proposal.

My colleague from Ohio has been a leader in the area of Government reform, and I would be interested in his observations on this issue.

Mr. GLENN. I share the concerns expressed by the senior Senator from

Massachusetts. The legislation before us proposes a Federal governance structure that is intended to maximize coordination between the Departments of Labor and Education in the oversight of education and training block grant funds. And it is intended to increase the private sector's influence on education and training policy through a national board. Although these are desirable goals, they would be achieved through a governance structure, including proposed staff reductions, that would be virtually unworkable because it violates several basic principles of organizational reform.

First, it violates the principle of establishing clear lines of authority, by creating a new "Workforce Development Partnership" within the Departments of Labor and Education under the direction of a national board. The Workforce Development Partnership, as it stands, is so unwieldy that I fear it may be unworkable, and the resulting disorder would undermine the promise of devolving greater responsibilities to the States. When you have accountability dispersed across two departments and one board, you really don't have accountability. Instead, you have confusion, "passing the buck" and a failure to solve problems.

Second, it violates the principle of matching functions and structures. Experience shows that boards are good at some things: venting a broad array of opinion; debating issues; formulating policy; and ensuring consensus for that policy. Boards are not good, however, at carrying out administrative and management responsibilities, in part because of the need to make quick decisions. This bill assigns various administrative and management responsibilities to the national board that it is least capable of carrying out. The board's failure to effectively carry out such administrative and management responsibilities could undermine the ability of the States to implement a new work force development system.

Third, it violates the principle that adequate resources should be provided to carry out a task, by specifying an arbitrary and significant staffing cut that is likely to undermine the critical Federal role in making the transition to the new work force development system. The drastic change required by this legislation raises enormous transition problems. Putting this into place will require considerable imagination, innovation, patience, and investment—of time and money.

This is very hard to do if one partner is crippled by arbitrary staffing cuts at the beginning. This bill does not envision a handsoff role for the Federal Government. It instead mandates a very important Federal role—particularly in the transition—with respect to assisting the States in establishing new innovative, performance-based systems; charting new work force development plans; creating one-stop shopping for individuals and employers; measuring the success of the sys-

tem and integrating it with other efforts. A proper Federal role is the key to promoting accountability and efficiency and to ensuring that confusion at the Federal level will not undermine the ambitious goals of the work force development system.

I would like to illustrate the challenges of transition by focusing on grant closeout. Based on the Department of Labor's most recent major program closeout—the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act [CETA]—the closeout effort would likely take 2 to 3 years. Planning for the CETA closeout began in early 1982. Although CETA ceased operations on October 13, 1983, most related closeout activity was not completed until the end of 1985. Considerable resources were involved in bringing to an end the 10-year program in 470 localities. The Department's Office of Inspector General was also heavily involved, and in its 1984 semiannual report noted " \* \* \* it was necessary to devote tremendous audit resources to ensure the fiscal integrity of the closeout."

This is not to say that some staffing cuts in the future may not be appropriate. Before specifying such cuts, however, we need to take heed of a simple lesson from the business world: successful reforms are goal-oriented and carefully planned. The first step is to ask what you are trying to accomplish. Moving boxes around on an organizational chart looks impressive and satisfies our desire for action. But it does not make for good policy. It would not achieve the desired results and would certainly impose a period of transitional chaos.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for raising these important issues.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator from Ohio has made it clear that restructuring, while desirable, has to be thoughtfully done. Restructuring in business and government shows that structure is secondary to mission in successful reform efforts. Restructuring requires careful planning. This bill puts the cart before the horse. The Federal partnership would begin with a cut, without careful consideration of what needs to be achieved at the Federal level and the staffing level required to carry out such activities.

I look forward to the conference where I hope we will have an opportunity to fix some of these problems.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator ABRAHAM be added as a cosponsor to S. 143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I believe there are no further amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know of none on our side.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Although I support this legislation and am voting for it, I continue to have concerns about various provisions in it. I am particularly concerned about the

Federal governance structure mandated in the bill, including: The ambiguous relationship between the two Secretaries; the unprecedented use of a board structure to run an operating agency; the composition of the proposed Federal partnership; and the drastic Federal staffing cuts specified in the bill. Each of these issues is worthy of concern. Taken together, there is cause for this efforts to be dead on arrival, simply unable to operate.

Proponents offer two key reasons for such significant organizational change—the first is to save money, and the second is to provide better service. I do not believe that we will achieve either under the current proposal.

I would be interested in the observations on this issue of my distinguished colleague, Senator GLENN, who has been a leader in the area of governmental reform.

Mr. GLENN. I share the concerns of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The legislation proposes a Federal governance structure that is intended to maximize coordination between the Department of Labor and Education in the oversight of education and training block grant funds, as well as increase the private sector's influence on education and training policy through a national board. Although these are desirable goals, they would be achieved through a governance structure, including proposed staff reductions, that would be virtually unworkable because it violates several basic principles of undertaking such organization reform.

First, it would violate the principle of establishing clear lines of authority, by creating a new work force development partnership within the Departments of Labor and Education under the direction of a national board. The work force development partnership, as it stands, is so unwieldy as to be devolving greater responsibilities to the States. You would have confusion, passing the buck, and a failure to solve problems.

Second, it would violate the principle of matching functions and structures. Experience shows that boards are good at some things: Venting a broad array of opinion; debating issues; making policy; and ensuring consensus for that policy. Boards are not good, however, at carrying out administrative and management responsibilities, in part because of the need to make quick decisions. This bill assigns various administrative and management responsibilities to the national board that it is least capable of carrying out. The Board's failure to carry out such administrative and management responsibilities effectively could undermine the ability of the States to implement a new work force development system.

Third, it would violate the principle of providing resources adequate for carrying out the task, by specifying an arbitrary one-third staffing cut that is likely to undermine the critical Federal role in making the transition to



the new work force development system. The drastic change required by this legislation raises enormous transition problems. It requires considerable imagination, innovation, patience, and investment—of time and money—to put in place.

This is very hard to do if one partner is crippled by arbitrary staffing cuts at the beginning. This bill does not envision a hands-off role for the Federal Government. It instead mandates a very important Federal role, particularly in the transition, with respect to assisting the States in establishing new, innovative, performance-based systems, charting new, work force development plans, creating one-stop shopping for individuals and employers, measuring the success of the system, and integrating it with other efforts. A proper Federal role is the key to promoting accountability and efficiency and to ensure that confusion at the Federal level will not undermine the ambitious goals of the work force development system.

I would like to illustrate the challenges of transition by focusing on grant closeout. Based on the Department of Labor's most recent major program closeout—the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act [CETA], the closeout effort would be likely to take 2 to 3 years. Planning for the CETA closeout began in early 1982. Although CETA ceased operations on October 13, 1983, most related closeout activity was not completed until the end of 1985. Considerable resources were involved in bringing to an end the 10-year program in 470 localities. The Department's office of the inspector general also was heavily involved, and in its 1994 semiannual report noted “\* \* \* it was necessary to devote tremendous audit resources to ensure the fiscal integrity of the closeout.”

This is not to say that some Federal staffing cuts in the future may be not appropriate. Before specifying such cuts, however, we need to take heed of a simple lesson from the business world: Successful reforms are goal-oriented and carefully planned. The first step is to ask what you are trying to accomplish. Moving boxes around on an organizational chart looks impressive and satisfies our desire for action. But it does not make for good policy. It would not achieve the desired results and would certainly impose a period of transitional chaos.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator from Ohio has made it clear that restructuring, while desirable, has to be thoughtfully done. Restructuring requires careful planning. This bill puts the cart before the horse. The Federal partnership would begin with a cut, without careful consideration of what needs to be achieved at the Federal level and the staffing level required to carry out such activities.

I look forward to the conference and an opportunity to begin fixing these problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2885, as amended.

So the amendment (No. 2885), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be immediately discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1617, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 143, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; further, that H.R. 1617 then be read for a third time and the Senate immediately proceed to vote on passage of the bill.

I further ask consent that following passage of H.R. 1617, the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, and S. 143 be placed back on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1617) to consolidate and reform work force development and literacy programs and for other purposes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of H.R. 1617, as amended.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] is absent due to a death in the family.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 487 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Chafee	Frist
Akaka	Coats	Glenn
Ashcroft	Cochran	Gorton
Baucus	Conrad	Graham
Bennett	Coverdell	Gramm
Biden	Craig	Grams
Bingaman	D'Amato	Grassley
Bond	Daschle	Gregg
Boxer	DeWine	Harkin
Bradley	Dodd	Hatch
Breaux	Dole	Hatfield
Brown	Domenici	Heflin
Bryan	Dorgan	Helms
Bumpers	Exon	Hollings
Burns	Faircloth	Hutchison
Byrd	Feingold	Inhofe
Campbell	Ford	Inouye

Jeffords	Mack	Roth
Johnston	McCain	Santorum
Kassebaum	McConnell	Sarbanes
Kempthorne	Mikulski	Shelby
Kennedy	Moseley-Braun	Simpson
Kerrey	Murkowski	Smith
Kerry	Murray	Snowe
Kohl	Nickles	Specter
Kyl	Nunn	Stevens
Lautenberg	Pell	Thomas
Leahy	Pressler	Thompson
Levin	Pryor	Thurmond
Lieberman	Reid	Warner
Lott	Robb	Wellstone
Lugar	Rockefeller	

NAYS—2

Feinstein Simon

NOT VOTING—2

Cohen Moynihan

So, the bill (H.R. 1617), as amended, was passed.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the title to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to consolidate Federal employment training, vocational education, and adult education programs and create integrated statewide workforce development systems, and for other purposes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, in approving the Workforce Development Act, I believe the Senate has taken a great step forward in reforming Federal work force development efforts. It truly is a major and innovative approach that I think will serve both our education and job training arenas with great success.

Arriving at this point has been a long and difficult endeavor. Wiping the slate clean, so to speak, has meant convincing those who have invested time in existing programs that there is a better way to accomplish their goals. Taking the next step in developing that better way has proven to be just as challenging.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the time and effort put into this legislation has been worth it. We now have a blueprint for a system in which the needs of all who require a job, job training and job training-related education can be addressed. It is a system where the States will have flexibility to fit their needs while being accountable to the public for the use of Federal funds. It is a system which creates incentives for the involvement of a true partnership among job training advocates, educators, the business community, and State governments.

It has taken a couple of years, if not more, to put this proposal together and many hearings and consultations and many individuals have made major contributions to this effort. It is not possible to name them all. However, I do want to acknowledge several of them.

In particular, I express my appreciation to the members of my staff who have worked on this legislation: Ted Verheggen, Carla Widener, Wendy Cramer, Bob Stokes, and Susan Hattan. Other staff of committee members on both sides of the aisle have also made significant contributions to this legislation. From the Republican staff, I would include Sherry Kaiman and Reg Jones with Senator JEFFORDS, Pat Morrissey and Carol Fox with Senator FRIST, Dwayne Sattler with Senator DeWINE, Rick Murphy with Senator GREGG, Don Trigg with Senator ASHCROFT, and Gregg Willhauck with Senator ABRAHAM.

On the Democratic side of the aisle, I would like to express appreciation particularly to Ellen Guiney, Libby Street, Sarah Fox, and Omer Waddles with Senator KENNEDY; David Evans and Kevin Wilson with Senator PELL; Suzanne Day with Senator DODD; Charlie Barrone with Senator SIMON; Bobby Silverstein and Bev Schroeder with Senator HARKIN. I also want to recognize the efforts of Liz Aldridge and Mark Sigurski, who produced the legislative language with many of the incarnations of this legislation. In some ways this perhaps is the most trying and difficult part of the bill.

A special thanks also goes to Rick Appling and Ann Lordaman, of the Congressional Research Service. The staff of the General Accounting Office, the leadership of the Republican Governors Workforce Development Task Force, and many individuals in the business and education communities also lent valuable support to this effort.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to say a special word about Steve Spinner. Senator KENNEDY gave an eloquent tribute to Steve Spinner in his opening remarks as we started the debate on the Workforce Development Act. As a member of Senator KENNEDY's staff, he worked very closely with me and my staff in developing the work force training provisions of this bill. He cared very deeply about bringing about reform in this area and offered invaluable advice, assistance and suggestions based on his experience in the field. His dedication and professionalism earned him great respect on both sides of the aisle. Unfortunately, Steve died of cancer a few weeks ago. We deeply regret his loss and regret he was unable to see through an effort to which he had devoted so much time and talent.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the good chairman of our committee was speaking with her heart and soul about the extraordinary work of Steve Spinner who spent an enormous amount of time and energy in the developing and shaping of this legislation. He died just 2 weeks ago, at a young age, but made a remarkable contribution, which, through this legislation, other good works will live on for a very considerable period of time. And because of his

works, young and old will have a better opportunity to have a more hopeful life, a better chance to provide for their families.

We are, I think, all extremely fortunate to have the help and assistance of extraordinary, dedicated men and women who help us with our legislative duties, but more than that are highly motivated and incredibly gifted and talented in their profession and whose work is absolutely essential and invaluable in shaping legislation. Steve Spinner falls in that category, as well as so many others that Senator KASSEBAUM mentioned and that I will include.

But Steve Spinner was a rare, uncommon individual. And I think those of us who serve on that committee are mindful at this moment with the successful passage of the legislation, not just by the handful of votes which would have been sufficient to see its completion, but the extraordinary efforts to try to encompass the breadth of this body in terms of focusing and giving attention to the needs of those that will benefit from this legislation was really extraordinary. And I think to a great degree the fact that we have had such overwhelming support for this legislation was a real tribute to Steve and his efforts and energies over a long period of time. Others were certainly indispensable as that path went along, but I think Steve, all of us recognized, was someone who was very, very gifted.

I also would mention Steve's wife, Claire and daughter Elisa at this moment as well. Elisa is 4 years old, and Claire was a very lovely and wonderful, devoted companion.

Mr. President, the legislation which we voted on this afternoon is a culmination of a long, bipartisan effort to reexamine and refocus the Federal role in the education and training of America's workers. And this complex effort involves many separate decisions and judgments about the services that are most effective, the appropriate roles of the Federal, State, and local governments in job training and how best to ensure that available resources are targeted to those who need them the most.

Much of our debate over the last 2 days has been focused on those questions, and appropriately so. But as we face the vote on the final passage of the legislation, it was important to consider how much is at stake in this bill and how important this issue is to our country and to its future.

The challenges of creating a world-class work force are central to America's ability to compete successfully in the global economy. It is also central to our standard of living and the quality of life for all of our people. The economic indicators are sending a message that none of us can ignore. Corporate profits are up, productivity is increasing, but the wages of most Americans are not.

Since 1979, the national household income has increased, but almost all of

that increase has gone to families in the top 20 percent. And 60 percent of American households have actually seen their family incomes in real dollars decrease. The gap in income between the most affluent and least affluent members of our society is greater today than at any time since records began to be kept after World War II. It far exceeds the gap in any other industrial nation in the world. And the gap is widening, not decreasing.

Many different factors have contributed to this problem, but one element in the picture stands out. Men and women who lack education and job skills are having the hardest time of all. Three-quarters of American workers are without 4-year college degrees. They have suffered the steepest drop in wages and benefits. At the start of the 1980's, a male college graduate typically earned 49 percent more than a male high school graduate. Today the differential is 85 percent. The evidence is overwhelming that one realistic way toward reversing that dangerous trend is to improve the education and training available to workers.

For every year of additional education or job training after high school, a worker's income increases by 6 to 12 percent. That is why the legislation we are considering today is so important. The Federal Government has had a long history of involvement in job training, from the manpower programs in the 1960's to CETA in the 1970's to the Job Training Partnership Act of the 1980's, and many other training programs administered by the Department of Labor or the Department of Education.

The record of success is clearly mixed. And what we are attempting to do at the Federal level today is a clear departure from what we have done in the past and taking us into new territory. Our past job training policy was based on the assumption that the vast majority of workers would acquire basic skills in schools and that these skills would enable young men and women to attain good jobs with decent wages and benefits and work productively in those jobs for the rest of their lives.

On this basis, Federal training programs focused on particular groups facing special barriers—the disadvantaged, the disabled, and in more recent years the dislocated worker. There was a clear recognition that members of these groups needed special assistance. But at the same time, it was assumed most workers were already in the mainstream and could succeed effectively on their own.

We have had a rude awakening. In the highly competitive global economy that has emerged in recent years, U.S. workers have been losing ground. And in the painful process of analyzing that decline, we have come to realize that on the issue of job training we have not been doing the job.

It is not just the disadvantaged, disabled, and dislocated who suffer from

inadequate education and training; it is a work-force-wide problem. Compared to other nations, we have clearly been underinvesting in the education and training of the vast majority of our workers. And American working families are paying a heavy price for that neglect.

Now for the first time we are looking at Federal training programs as part of a competitiveness strategy, central to the Nation's overall economic future. And that, in turn, has required us to broaden our outlook, to start seeing these issues in terms of the need for the kind of broader bipartisan reform we are recommending today.

In a sense, this bipartisan movement for reform began with Senator Dan Quayle's Job Training Partnership Act in 1982 and its effort to involve the private sector more closely in such reform.

The second major milestone on the road to reform was the 1990 reform report of America's Choice Commission, cochaired by two distinguished former Secretaries of Labor, Bill Brock and Ray Marshall, and their clear warning that unless we changed our ways, we were on the race to the bottom in the global economy.

The next major landmark was the 1992 report by the congressional General Accounting Office that so effectively blew the whistle on the current confusing array of Federal programs, and the past two Congresses picked up the challenge. We held bipartisan hearings on all of these challenges, enacted initial important reforms, such as the school-to-work legislation signed by President Clinton. And throughout this process in recent years, Senator KASSEBAUM and I have worked closely together to agree on the broad direction of reform. This legislation is the result of both of our efforts, and I commend her for her leadership, for without her leadership, we would not be where we are today.

We have not always agreed on all of the details, but we have certainly agreed on the major directions of the reforms we need. But we both are well aware that there are no simple answers and no silver bullets. We have approached this challenge with a maximum of bipartisanship and minimum of ideology.

This legislation is, obviously, not a final answer to the serious challenges that we face, but is a far better answer than we have had so far. I am grateful that the Senate has passed it by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. President, I want to join in mentioning very briefly our colleagues who have participated in this so actively. I mentioned the significant and outstanding leadership of the chairperson of our committee, Senator KASSEBAUM, whose commitment in this area has been really extraordinary. When we look over the broad range of debates and discussions that we have had over the period of this Congress, I think this really stands out as an extraordinary

effort to try and bring together the diverse viewpoints and ideas and do it in a way which really represents the best in legislative effort in drawing the strong bipartisan support, and support from all the different elements of this body:

Senator JEFFORDS, with his strong commitment in education and the Adult Education Program, with our colleague Senator PELL, who has done so much in chairing and being the ranking minority member of the education committee for such a long period of time;

For Senators SPECTER and SIMON, who were so committed on the issues of the Job Corps and who spent a great deal of time on that issue;

To my friend and colleague, Senator DODD on the dislocated workers and the national priorities which will extend not only to the industrial areas but also will include the national priorities for those all over this Nation. It is an important program and we are grateful for his leadership;

Senator BREAUX and Senator DASCHLE for the work that they did in devising a completely different concept in permitting the maximum flexibility for individuals to make choices and selections out of the wide, diverse numbers of training programs so that they would be able to maximize their own skills and talents and innovative programs which they have pursued for some period of time and which has been included in this legislation;

Senator MOYNIHAN on the trade adjustment.

Senator MIKULSKI, who was so much involved in the senior community employment issue and which was not a part of this program, but she was so much involved in its continued success.

Senator KASSEBAUM has mentioned many of those who have been so involved. I want to particularly recognize Omer Waddles, who has done such extraordinary work, particularly in following up on the superb work of Steve Spinner, Ellen Guiney, Libby Street, Ross Eisenbrey, Greg Young, Sarah Fox, and Nick Littlefield, our general counsel, who is tireless in all of his endeavors and work on this legislation; Dave Evans, Mort Zuckerman for Senator SIMON; Suzanne Day, Bev Schroeder, Senator HARKIN; Bobby Silverstein, again, with Senator HARKIN.

Even though Senator KASSEBAUM has mentioned some of those who have served with her on the Republican side, we often find that their talents are invaluable to all of us on this issue.

There are many others: Susan Hattan, Ted Verheggen, Carla Widener, and Wendy Cramer. To all of those and others, I am enormously grateful for their support.

I want to thank the majority leader for scheduling this legislation and the minority leader as well for giving it a priority for us as well.

I am glad we were able to move this process forward. We look forward to the conference with the House Mem-

bers, and we hope that the spirit of comity and cooperation and bipartisanship, which has been reflected in this debate during the past few days, will be evident in the conference and when the conference report returns.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator KENNEDY. This was a priority matter, and it was completed on schedule, on time. I thank both my colleagues for that.

#### CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to consideration of calendar No. 202, H.R. 927, the Cuba sanctions bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2898

(Purpose: To strengthen international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to develop a plan to support a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a substitute amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. MACK, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KYL, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. ROBB, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. REID, Mr. LOTT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. PRESSLER, proposes an amendment numbered 2898.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows: